

Daniel's Last Vision : A Modern Fulfillment

Introduction

The original interpretation (Antiochus) of Daniel's Last Vision can no longer be maintained due to the errors in the application of the actual historical record to the Sacred Text and, therefore, I think that it is time to show that the vision was not fulfilled in the events leading up to Antiochus Epiphanes, as most Scholars assume, but that they have a more modern fulfillment.

Below is a detailed, verse by verse fulfillment which, I believe, will one day be considered the classic. I will not spend the time on the opening verses of the chapter but will move right into the vision itself. I have divided the article into two sections the first of which contains those verses that have been fulfilled in the past and the second section is those verses that will be fulfilled in the future and a possible description of how they will be fulfilled.

I have included my critique of the original interpretation in the appendix at the end of this PDF which see.

All Scripture quotes come from the King James Version of the Bible.

David T. Hill --Daniel's Last Vision 16:58, 23 December 2006 (UTC) - *originally published 1999 AD*

Fulfilled Verses

Daniel 11:2

"And now will I shew thee the truth. Behold, there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia and the fourth shall be far richer than they all and by his strength through his riches he shall stir up all against the realm of Grecia."

"Three Kings in Persia." That Cyrus the Great's Persian Empire did have three succeeding kings (Cambyses II, Darius I, and Xerxes [Ahasuerus of Esther]) is a matter of history. (F&W Vol 19 pg 6958 'Persia'). "The Fourth shall be richer." The work of Darius at building up the kingdom was reaped by Xerxes, thus fulfilling the description (ibid). He subsequently blew it all on an attempt to subdue the rising Greek Empire. "Stir up all." That Xerxes spent three years building up this army and, according to Herodotus, the size of the invading land and naval forces amounted to the "incredible total of 2,641,610 men" shows that he did indeed stir up all of his 127 provinces (ibid).

Daniel 11:3

"And a mighty king shall stand up, that shall rule with great dominion and do according to his will."

"A Mighty King" is obviously Alexander the Great who did do pretty much whatever he wanted to, including, according to one source, the assassination his own father at the prompting of his mother, so that he could ascend the throne early.

Daniel 11:4

"And when he shall stand up, his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven; and not to his posterity, nor according to his dominion which he ruled: for his kingdom shall be plucked up, even for others beside those."

"Kingdom Broken" is the same word used in 8:8 implying an untimely death which some have attributed to assassination (Green pg 475), by his four generals. However, the Scriptures say that it was "for others besides those" four generals. He was threatened with death by the Priests of Babylon if he didn't rebuild their temple, which he declined to do, then he died (ibid pg 476-77). It appears that the temple priests assassinated him because he didn't restore their temple, and thus their kingdom.

"The Four Winds" are referring to the kingdom being divided up to the four spirits or breaths or the Four Chief Winds which found its perfect counterpart in the four generals of Alex's kingdom - Antigonus, Lysimachus, Ptolemy I Soter and Seleucus I Nicator (F&W vol 12, pg 4259, 'Greece'), as opposed to "his prosperity " or his son. Since these Four Spirits in the Spiritual Realm had their earthly counterpart then this indicates that the first Seal of the Book of Revelation, i.e., the first spirit or horseman, will also find its earthly counterpart in the Antichrist - the conqueror bent on conquest.

Daniel 11:5

"And the king of the south shall be strong, and one of his princes; and he shall be strong above him, and have dominion; his dominion shall be a great dominion."

"King of the South" is obviously Ptolemy, who did become greater than the other three, with his capital at Alexandria becoming the greatest city in the Roman Empire, second only to Rome (with Antioch of Seleucus - The King of the North - coming in third; ibid). "One of his princes" is referring to Ptolemy III surnamed Euergetes "The Benefactor", who brought the kingdom to its highest point in power and wealth (ibid, vol. 20, pg 7320 "Ptolemy"). And here the stage has been set and the Biblical record, referenced by our Lord (Mt 24:15 etc) jumps ahead from the times of the Grecian Empire to "The Latter Days."

Daniel 11:6

"And in the end of years they shall join themselves together; for the king's daughter of the south shall come to the king of the north to make an agreement: but she shall not retain the power of

the arm; neither shall he stand, nor his arm: but she shall be given up, and they that brought her, and he that begat her, and he that strengthened her in these times."

"The End of Years" is a direct and unmistakable reference to the end of the Middle Ages and beginning of the Modern Era or the "Age of Enlightenment" (compare 12:4), which all historians recognize, and most place at the end of the Crusades (Mainstream pg 345-46). As if to make no mistake, the Angel (12:4) states that at this period of time, "many shall run to and fro and knowledge shall be increased" which is a crystal clear and concise description of this very time, with increased global exploration, and especially that of the New World, and the invention of the printing press with its resultant explosion in the search for knowledge which has ended in the Telecommunication Revolution in our day, where, purportedly, knowledge doubles every fourteen months.

"The King's daughter of the South" is referring, therefore, to Shajarat al-Durr who, upon the death of her husband ("neither shall he stand" and "nor his arm" - she had his son killed, presumably, so she could rule), became the first woman after Cleopatra to rule Egypt (for 80 days). In fact, according to at least one source, Cleopatra never actually ruled the country alone as Shajarat did but with a Consort (her younger brother) and her Prime Minister (Dioiketes), which, if true, means she never had "the power of the arm" to lose and this would make Shaggar the only possible fulfiller of the vision.

She actually took authority over the nation at the time of her husband's death and ruled for eighty days and not only had coins struck in her image (as Cleopatra had done), but had the Daily Prayers performed in her name (unlike Cleopatra). She was forced to remarry ("Shall not retain the power of the arm"), and her new husband met an untimely death ("he that strengthened her in those times"), as she also did thus being "given up]." The key to this passage is the fact that she was a Mameluk [7].

"They that brought her" would be the Ayyubid Dynasty itself, which was overthrown at this time by the Mameluks. "Join themselves together" is further clarified by the "make an agreement" which is referring to Shajar trying to solidify her rule as the Sultana of Egypt by sending an ambassador to Damascus demanding the alliance of Syria (where the word "come to" can also be translated as "send to" per Strong's - this actually is much more logical as the "agreement" according to the original interpretation was her marriage to a Syrian - not a political agreement).

She is here called the "kings daughter of the south" being his daughter-in-law, which is the same word (Strong's 1323), and in fact this is the word he would have to use describing this relationship. All was going well until the Caliph of Baghdad told the Mameluks to find a man to rule them. What is interesting is that, according to Baibar-Roman (David Duncan, Footnote 5), the Caliph was "he that begat her" or Shajar's father (al-Musta'sim, the Abbasid Caliph who died 1258 AD). He obviously didn't like the idea that his own daughter would have more power than himself. Keep in mind that he obviously married her off to the Ayyubids to try and gain control over them.

This caused her, outwardly, to 'abdicate' ("shall not retain the power of the arm") to strengthen this "allegiance" (ibid Mernissi section 30) with the "king of the north." And this same attitude directly caused his own downfall, for the Mameluks of Egypt were the only ones that held the Mongol Empire at bay. By breaking with his own daughter, and causing a rift in the Mameluks, when Genghis Khan's grandson Hulagu Khan invaded Iraq, there was no organized resistance and he himself was "given up" and killed in the invasion.

Daniel 11:7-8

"But out of a branch of her roots shall one stand up in his estate, which shall come with an army, and shall enter into the fortress of the king of the north, and shall deal against them, and shall prevail. And shall also carry captives into Egypt their gods, with their princes, and with their precious vessels of silver and of gold; and he shall continue more years than the king of the north."

"A branch of her roots" is the subsequent Mameluk ruler Baybars I, who took control after her untimely death. "The fortress of the King of the North" is the Selucid capital of Antioch, which Baybars conquered in 1260, plundering the city (where "gods" is Christian image worship called Iconodules as opposed to Iconoclasts, "American Peoples Ency., Pg 504-07, vol 4, "Byzantine Empire"), and taking thousands captive (The Arabs, pgs 218, 231, 232, 240 and Scribner's pgs 103-04-, vol 1, 'Antioch'). "He shall continue more years then the King of the North" is Baybar (as opposed to Musta'sim the above mentioned Caliph), who reigned for 17 yrs (as opposed to 16) and who lived to be fifty (as opposed to 46) and who died in 1277 (as opposed to 1258).

Daniel 11:9

"So the king of the south shall come into his kingdom, and shall return into his own land."

"Come into his kingdom" where his kingdom, once established, was considered greater than Saladin's (ibid pg 242).

Daniel 11:10

"But his sons shall be stirred up, and shall assemble a multitude of great forces. And one shall certainly come, and overflow, and pass through : then shall he return, and be stirred up, even to his fortress."

"His sons shall be stirred up" are the sons of the king of the north and not Baybar's sons (as even the original interpretation states). This can actually be gleaned from the context where the following verse specifies that the King of the South comes out to fight with him, even the King of the North which makes this latter the subject of this verse - thus the sons of the King of the North.

At this time the Ottoman Empire entered into a period of civil war (Dict. of Wars pgs 328-29), which, though common to all the Arab dynasties,, the Ottomans were known for it because of a principle of "indivisibility of rule" by which the Sultan was given permission to commit fratricide (ibid). Specifically Bayazid I, Mehmed II, Bayazid II vs Djem his brother.

"One shall surely come" notes that during this time of civil war in the Ottoman Empire, Tamerlane (a Turk by birth, but raised as a Mongol) came waltzing through Eurasia, like Alexander, never losing a war (except to death). When he finished in Asia and Syria (Mameluk territory), he returned to "his fortress", Samarkand, where he, being "stirred up" planned yet another invasion, this time of China, and died en route to the same. (Dict of wars pgs 455-58).

Daniel 11:11

"And the king of the south shall be moved with choler, and shall come forth and fight with him, even with the king of the north: and he shall set forth a great multitude; but the multitude shall be given into his hand."

"Shall be moved with cholar and come forth" is the first Mameluke-Ottoman war (ibid pg 270-71, 474) where the civil wars of the Ottomans encroached on Mameluk territory leading to their first series of battles. Over the course of six annual campaigns the Turks were not able to triumph over the Mameluks (F&W vol 23, pg 8098 'Turkey'). "A great Multitude" during the Mameluk-Ottoman wars, specifically in 1488 when Kait Bey "gained a great victory over the Ottomans" (Bayezid II of the Burjel Dynasty) which resulted in the "Peace of Tunis" in 1491. "Shall come forth" shows the aggressive nature of Bey which gave so much trouble to Bayezid, as he expanded his own territory into Tarsus and Adana.

Daniel 11:12

"And when he hath taken away the multitude, his heart shall be lifted up; and he shall cast down many ten thousands: but he shall not be strengthened by it."

"Heart shall be lifted up." The sixth war, mentioned above, ended in a truce and land concessions in the Mameluk's favor (Dict of Wars, pg 270-71). "Shall not be strengthened" because of the subsequent invasion mentioned below.

Daniel 11:13

"For the king of the north shall return, and shall set forth a multitude greater than the former, and shall certainly come after certain years with a great army and with much riches."

"King of the North shall return" is Selim I's invasion in 1517, "after certain years" i.e., the last war in 1491 (Dict of Wars pg 271) who took many cities on his way into Cairo (ibid). "With much riches" was a result of his previous Persian campaign and its subsequent plunder (ibid pg 475).

Daniel 11:14

"And in those times there shall many stand up against the king of the south: also the robbers of thy people shall exalt themselves to establish the vision; but they shall fall."

"Many shall stand up" against the Mameluks to wit: Salim I, Napoleon (as we will see), The English, The Ottoman's via Mehemet Ali, "an Albanian adventurer", and finally General Ibrahim Pasha of Egypt (F&W vol 16, pg 5793, 'Mamelukes' and Hist. of the Balkans, pg 294).

"The robbers of your people" was fulfilled during a time of the revival of the spirit of Messianism in Europe (which had a direct effect on France and probably led to Napoleon's policy of assimilating the Jews) when an individual named Sabbatai Zevi claimed to be the Messiah and traveled to Israel where a Kabbalah toting Rabbi anointed him as such and together they "exalted themselves" and tried to "establish the vision" and managed to defraud many of the Jews of their money. Their "fall" occurred when he was escorted into the presence of the Sultan and forced to convert or die, which he did (Who's Who in Jewish History).

Daniel 11:15

"So the king of the north shall come, and cast up a mount, and take the most fenced cities: and the arms of the south shall not withstand, neither his chosen people, neither shall there be any strength to withstand."

"The King of the North" returns back to Salim's invasion and overthrow of the Mameluks in Egypt, with verse 14 being parenthetical in accordance with common Hebrew Literary practice of returning to fill in the details of a specific train of thought. "His chosen People" are the Mameluks themselves which were slaves-become-bodyguards who ended up gaining political control of Egypt while they served the Sultan (F&W vol 16, pg 5793 etc).

Daniel 11:16

"But he that cometh against him shall do according to his own will, and none shall stand before him: and he shall stand in the glorious land, which by his hand shall be consumed."

"He who comes against him" introduces the king of the west for the first time in the commentary after Alex himself. After his Egyptian campaign, Napoleon went up into Palestine "according to his own will" to strengthen France's position in the area (F&W vol 17, pg 6315 'Napoleon I').

"None shall stand" included the Mameluks who fled into the mountains at the invasion by Napoleon.

I originally believed that "the glorious land" was "consumed" by Napoleon due to a military tactic unique to him at the time, of living off the land which allowed his army to travel lighter and faster than the opposing armies (Holtman pg 42). This conclusion was a result of the scarcity of information in the Napoleonic Histories concerning his Palestinian Campaign. This practice may

have been a result of England having destroyed his supply ships off the coast of Egypt perhaps actually forcing Napoleon into this position which he subsequently made into his standard procedure.

As it turns out, as far as his Palestinian Campaign, he and his men actually torched the wheat fields on their way back to Egypt, after the failed siege of Acre, in perfect and precise fulfillment of the Angelic account. For more on this see the Post Scripts below. This area is actually the very fertile coast running through the western portion of the Esdraelon Plain in Palestine, the most glorious portion of Eretz Yisrael.

"According to his own will" is similar to vs 18 "For his own behalf" and is referring to Napoleon and Wellington respectively and this is the days before telephone and telegraph. Napoleon, after his conquest of Egypt, went up into the promised land to "strengthen France's position in the area" and obviously did so without permission from Home Base. As well, Wellington, who was in charge of an expeditionary force in Spain, upon Napoleon's disastrous campaign in Russia, likewise would not have wasted the time necessary to get in contact with London to gain permission to render the final blow to Napoleon's Army but would have entered France on his own behalf, smelling the blood of Napoleon's defeat. More on this in the Post Scripts.

Daniel 11:17

"He shall also set his face to enter with the strength of his whole kingdom, and upright ones with him; thus shall he do: and he shall give him the daughter of women, corrupting her: but she shall not stand on his side, neither be for him."

"Upright Ones with him" is referring to yet another practice that was peculiar to Napoleon and that was his attempt to assimilate the Jews by not allowing them to hire replacements for themselves in the military (as the Christians could). Thus for the first time the Jews served side by side with the Christians, which was surprisingly successful; enough for the Angel to make it a point of reference.

As well, he elevated the Protestants and the Jews to an equal status with the Catholics and thus had no trouble filling his conscription thus invading Austria, "with the strength" of his Empire (Napoleonic Revolution, pg 129-37).

"The daughter of Woman" can only be Marie Louise, Duchess of Parma, and this passage is also a parenthetical one. She was the daughter of the Austrian Emperor who was 'given' to Napoleon to appease him, when she was only about 15 or 16 years old (Nofi pg 15). When he abdicated the first time, she refused to "stand on his side" even though he retained the title and privileges of Emperor, and returned to Austria with their son. When he returned to the mainland to fight, it was with the hope that his father in law would support him, which he didn't presumably because Marie also was not even "for him", and assuredly influenced her father's attitude towards him. And in fact, his 'corruption' of her was complete, for shortly after this, she was to be seen openly with her lover in Austria (ibid pg 31) during this time.

Daniel 11:18

"After this shall he turn his face unto the isles, and shall take many: but a prince for his own behalf shall cause the reproach offered by him to cease; without his own reproach he shall cause it to turn upon him."

"After this" i.e. after his first Austrian campaign, and not his estrangement from Marie. "To the Isles" where this is obviously England and his desire to overthrow them which, failing to do with naval power, he tried to do by enforcing the Continental System against Britain. In the process of trying to enforce this blockade he conquered most of Europe - the three main powerhouses of Austria, Russia, and Prussia as well as the Papal States, Holland and N.W. Germany; all these combined are the "many" that he took just trying to conquer England (The Napoleonic Rev. pg 64 and Mainstream pgs 536-37), and thus it is not 'the isles' themselves which were subsequently taken.

"A prince for his own behalf" is Wellington (who had been knighted) who, instead of fighting Napoleon directly ("without his own reproach"), originally was in charge of an expeditionary force only, to help the Spanish in their fight against him, thus ensuring their victory, and the first defeat of Napoleon's army, causing "his reproach to cease". In the end Wellington entered France, assuredly acting "on his own behalf" which led to Napoleon's "stumble" and causing his "reproach" to "turn upon him" (F&W vol 25, pg 9139 'Wellington' also Holtman pg 50, 186). Notice, as well, the dual use of 'reproach' by the Scriptures, where Wellington caused the reproach to return upon him at his first and second abdications, as we will see.

Daniel 11:19

"Then he shall turn his face toward the fort of his own land: but he shall stumble and fall, and not be found."

"His own Land." After the failed Russian campaign, during which he was defeated, not by Russia, but by the elements, Napoleon returned to France to regroup where he was defeated, and exiled but with full rights as Emperor (Holtman pg 33), and thus only stumbled. "And Fall" and here you have the second abdication, mirrored by the two reproaches. After his exile, he returned to gather another force, and attacked the allies, who defeated him the second time at the Battle of Waterloo, which led to his second and last abdication and thus his fall, without any emperor status.

That Wellington was responsible for both of these, as the Scriptures state, and not Alexander I of Russia, comes straight from the Tsar's own mouth, who told Wellington, "It is for you to save the world again." (Nofi pg 29). "Not be found" is the description of his second 'home' in exile out in the middle of the Atlantic somewhere, where Wellington himself had been at one time (Holtman pg 34), where he subsequently died and was buried in an unmarked grave. More details in the Post Scripts.

Future Verses

It should be stated that most, if not all, of the prophecies; though originally given to the nations in the past; are primarily given for these end days. A casual reading through them will divulge predictions that can only be understood as end times in scope. These have been incorporated into this study (which is far from exhaustive, requiring a small book, at the least, to do the subject the justice it deserves such as the opening verses which I opted out of do to certain constraints), and provide a crystal clear chronological outline of this great work.

Of all the topical studies I have done, I have never seen such symmetry of detail and cohesion of witness as in this expedition into the Eschatology of the Nations. An unbiased examination of the statements and references made herein can only conclude a Divine hand holding the pen that framed the words of God's servants the prophets and with Isaiah (14:32) I can only say, "What shall one then answer the Angel to the Nations? That Y'hava has founded Zion and the poor of his people shall trust in it."

Daniel 11:20

"Then shall stand up in his estate a raiser of taxes in the glory of the kingdom: but within few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger, nor in battle."

"A raiser of taxes." Now, none of the individuals directly and subsequently involved in these events (i.e. Napoleon II, Napoleon III, Wellington, Louis XVIII, Charles X of France, Louis-Phillipe, or Metternich) in any way fulfill the descriptions here given. The only conclusion is that here we have the natural break in the history, when the Beast Kingdom receives it's head wound (as the beast himself will in the trib) and is the location in the Biblical record where the four end times empires start their rise (Book of Daniel 7).

Hence then, this individual is still future and will probably be the first President of the European Union, and will subsequently be 'assassinated' politically "not in anger or in battle" to make way for the rise of the Antichrist himself, which may make him one of the "three horns" that the Antichrist uproots his in rise to power.

And this very year they launched the Euro, which was immediately compared to the Roman Empire ("For the first time since the Roman Empire"), or in other words, "In the Glory of the Kingdom." Something to watch very closely. But "within few days" the individual is "destroyed" which, if you compare these Scriptures (1King 2:38-39, Acts 9:23 and Gal 1:8, see also Hos 3:4), can only be extended, Scripturally, to 3 years, as one author noted (which sheds some light on the original interpretation of this verse).

Daniel 11:21

"And in his estate shall stand up a vile person, to whom they shall not give the honor of the kingdom: but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries."

"In his estate" does not necessarily imply his rise in France, but in the estate of his predecessor the Raiser of Taxes, which I stated will probably be the first President of the EU. It describes this meteoric rise over the entire revived Roman Empire (Dan 2) and, undoubtedly the Vile person above is the Antichrist because the description, in many of the details, is the same as chapter 8 as well as in the Revelation.

I might add as well, that many see this phrase as implying that the Antichrist will not be of the accepted Royalties of Europe (in fact the two prominent monarchies of Europe would be the prime targets of the Antichrist in his rise), however the term ("vile person") is assuredly as the King James translates it as described by Habakkuk 2:15 (specifically stated to be "for an appointed time, at the end it shall speak").

He comes in "peaceably" (same word in 8:25) which means secure, and the attitude of that security which is tranquility, that is further defined by "flatteries" meaning something smooth, and treacherous (see below). Thus, he rises to power over the Empire by a tranquil spirit and a smooth tongue. This does not indicate a peace treaty, or a peaceful condition on the earth for the first half of the tribulation, as some have taught (Hal Lindsey, The Late Great Planet Earth); which is clearly seen by Y'shua's words to the contrary in the Olivet Discourse (Mt 24 etc), where the environment of the world at the start of the Time of Jacob's Trouble is "wars and rumors of wars" with nation against nation and "Superpower against Superpower" (my translation of 'kingdom').

This conclusively shows us the militant rise of the Antichrist in the first half of the tribulation. This is further confirmed by the rider on the white horse of Revelation 6:2, which will find its earthly counterpart in the Antichrist as the conqueror bent on conquest (where the Scriptures use the horse as a symbol of war as in the closing chapters of Job). And Daniel 7 confirms this when he tells us that the fourth beast tramples the first three beasts under feet, which, grammatically, is the focus of "the residue" of that passage.

Daniel 11:22

"And with the arms of a flood shall they be overflowed from before him, and shall be broken; yea, also the prince of the covenant."

The "Arms of a flood" indicates a military campaign, of some sort, that occurs in or near Palestine, where "they" shall "be overthflown" or conquered by him (Rev 6:2 again) and grammatically must be those who gave him the crown to the kingdom. This directly leads to the "covenant" which is assuredly the Mosaic Covenant (Dan 11:28-30, 9:27 and see also Is 33:8 and Ps 55:20), which is described as a league in the next verse.

Keep in mind that the Islamic World (i.e. Turkey) doesn't have any problems with animal sacrifice and this is assuredly how this covenant will be confirmed. This is then the first 'invasion' of Israel by the Antichrist. The "prince of the covenant" grammatically is this same individual, where 'also' is not in the original text (Strong's Concordance) and is to be interpreted, in accordance with proper Biblical Hermeneutics, by the normal Rules governing Grammar which then must be the same Prince that breaks and overflows them. *That being my original interpretation but it remains possible that it is the leader of Israel at that time.*

Daniel 11:23

"And after the league made with him he shall work deceitfully: for he shall come up, and shall become strong with a small people."

The "league" indicates that in (re)confirming the Mosaic Covenant that the Antichrist "joins" himself to the nation of Israel (by definition of the word). This is not a peace treaty, but a 'conversion' of the Antichrist to Judaism, and this is how some of them may be deceived into thinking that he is their Messiah. "Work deceitfully" makes him the Treacherous Dealer mentioned by Isaiah (chap. 21,24,33), all of which deals with the endtimes king of Babylon. And, since he starts his rise treacherously, this indicates a betrayal of his 'allies' very possibly as a result of this up coming war in the Middle East.

The "Small People" would be those from the country he starts his rise from (Turkey) which could be considered small as far as political influence is concerned, but more probably (as in the case of Hitler) is one of the political factions in that country. Keep in mind that Hitler rose to power in Germany, but was an Austrian by birth, which shows us that he may not be a member of the country (by citizenship or birth) that he rises to power in.

Daniel 11:24

"He shall enter peaceably even upon the fattest places of the province; and he shall do that which his fathers have not done, nor his fathers' fathers; he shall scatter among them the prey, and spoil, and riches: yea, and he shall forecast his devices against the strongholds, even for a time."

Further describes his campaigns affecting the mid east during the first half of the trib and precisely parallels Mt 24:6-7 and Rev 6:1-2 as well as Dan 8:9,23-24 and 7:8,20. "Peaceably" of this verse shows that this is still the first year of the tribulation, when he confirms the covenant.

"Fathers" is not specifically physical descent in political cases but a reference to his predecessors (as in vs 20), commonly used in Patriarchal Societies (i.e. George Washington the Father of America), and is thus the "remote and figurative" definition of the word in Strong's. The dual use of the word is to emphasize his actions, not his ancestry.

The "fattest places of the province" is a significant statement. Not only does it entail "a fertile field" (the coast and Jezreel Valley) but a province entails "to rule" and "to strive" and would today be the disputed territories of Gaza and the West Bank. This designation is set in contrast to the "glorious land" (vs 41) indicating that the dispute is settled by then; here at the start of the trib, the significance lies chiefly in the fact that, when he comes to Israel's aid in this confrontation, it will look like the Battle of Armageddon because that is where, at least some of, the conflict will be resolved; a "mini-armageddon" literally and this is looking more and more to me to be the Strong Delusion that Apostle Paul talks about, regardless of what else it entails. In the process of that little mini armageddon, assuredly they will bomb the Euphrates back to its original course.

"Forecast Devices against the Strongholds" unfortunately, is a reference (I believe) to the pre-emptive use of tactical nukes (possibly ICBMs) against the current political infrastructures of certain nations that are currently contenders for the position of World Ruler (Dan 7:7), as well as some of the cities in the area that may be involved in this conflict.

The "Time" of this verse implies (as in Dan 7:25 and Rev 12:14) that his military assault will continue for the first year of the trib, which is the first seal of Revelation. This warrior aspect of the Antichrist's career from the meteoric rise till its final conclusion, is apparent in most, if not all, of the prophecies of the nations. He is called the Oppressor (Is 14), the Destroyer of the Cities of the World (Is 14), which is assuredly the same as "those who destroy the earth" (Rev 11:18), The Spoiler (Is 33), The Hammer of the whole earth (Jer 50), The Destroying Mountain (Jer 51:25 compare Mt 17:20, Rev 18:21 and Jer 51:64), and the Dragon that swallows the nations (Jer 51:34); all of which reveals the nature of this leading personage in the final passages of Daniel, and it is not a professional paper-pushing Politician, but that of a professional warrior, who is obsessed with bloodlust (he likes to do his own killing and lots of it), which progressively consumes him right up to the bitter end. He is just like his father who was "a murderer from the beginning" (John 8:44 and Gen 4:8).

Daniel 11:25

"And he shall stir up his power and his courage against the king of the south with a great army; and the king of the south shall be stirred up to battle with a very great and mighty army; but he shall not stand: for they shall forecast devices against him."

Immediately after this conflict, he seizes the opportunity, and attacks "the king of the south" or Egypt, who comes out to meet him, but is destroyed by the same "devices."

Daniel 11:26

"Yea, they that feed of the portion of his meat shall destroy him, and his army shall overflow: and many shall fall down slain."

"They that feed on the portion of his meat" shall destroy the king of the south. The phrase is very similar to Ob 7 "They that eat thy bread have laid a wound under thee." Since the Negev was anciently Esau (to whom Obadiah was speaking), and is now under Egypt's authority, then these two verses are certainly referring to traitors that sell out Egypt to the Antichrist and whom Isaiah refers to as, "the princes of Zoan are fools" (Is 19:13).

They motivate the king of the south to go out "to the border" precisely as here in Daniel. The wound is assuredly the device mentioned by Daniel and taken together indicate a pre-positioning of the same which then destroys his "great and mighty army" which the Antichrist "overflows." The location where they clash may be provided by Amos (1:5) which states that the Syrians will go into captivity to Kir, which is southeast of the Dead Sea (modern day Kerak). Thus, seeing the Antichrist victorious over the previous conflict, Egypt comes up to attack him through the Negev, via the ancient King's Highway. The Antichrist, with Syrian captives in tow, moves to confront him, and possibly maneuver him into position, and then destroys his army.

Daniel 11:27-29

"And both these kings' hearts shall be to do mischief, and they shall speak lies at one table; but it shall not prosper: for yet the end shall be at the time appointed. Then shall he return into his land with great riches; and his heart shall be against the holy covenant; and he shall do exploits, and return to his own land. At the time appointed he shall return, and come toward the south; but it shall not be as the former, or as the latter."

This apparently leads to some sort of truce and "they shall speak lies at one table" but "the time is not yet." And Egypt is now given over to "a cruel lord" (Is 19:4 and 20, Ez 32). It should be stated here that this first conflict with Egypt might possibly be also the judgment of Mt. Seir (Ezekiel 35), or Idumea also located in the Negev. It also should be stated that I do not think that this is the time of the fulfillment of Psalm 83 which mentions Jordan, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Palestine and Iraq who apparently are allied with Turkey and meet their judgment when it does (compare vs 9-11 with Is 10:26). Missing from the list is Syria, Iran (Persia), Libya and Ethiopia, who, then, were probably involved, one way or another, in the previous conflict. And, I might add, the latter three countries are the only ones that remain faithful to the Antichrist (Dan 11:43, Ez 38:5 and Jer 46:9); and who are possibly "the confederacy" (Ob 7) that sell out Egypt along with his own "wisemen."

As far as Syria being one of the first victims of the Antichrist's campaign, finds one possible answer in the oil pipeline that runs from Babylon in Iraq through Syria (and Lebanon) to the Med. Sea. Turkey, by the way, according to the National Geographic Society Map of the Caspian Sea (printed March 1999), is the "Gateway to the Black Sea and the Mediterranean." "Hurt not the oil or the wine" (Rev 6) and "whoever controls the Med controls the world" ought to be taking on a more pertinent aspect about now (*which would include controlling the Suez Canal explaining the invasion of Egypt three times*).

It is at this pause in the fighting that he begins to regret his part in the covenant with his heart "against the holy covenant" (compare Ez 38:10). "The Time Appointed" occurs at the midpoint of the tribulation, when he comes "toward the south" or Egypt again. But he will not be successful as the "former" invasion, or "the latter" invasion at the end of the trib. This indicates exactly three invasions of Egypt.

Daniel 11:30

"For the ships of Chittim shall come against him: therefore he shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant: so shall he do; he shall even return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant."

"The ships of Chittim" come against him, and here we have a verse that ties in and clarifies further Ezekiel 38. Chittim is modern day Cyprus (not Tarshish or England as I first supposed and certainly not Rome as the original interpretation has it), and it is Balaam, of all people, who fills in the details of Daniel's Last Vision about 800 years before he received it.

In Numbers 24 he states, "ships will come from the coasts of Chittim and shall afflict Asshur." Now, he specifically stated that this prophecy was for "the latter days" and Asshur is the same as Isaiah's Assyrian (chapter 14) which he also calls the Babylonian in the same chapter. Keep in mind that the ships may have originated elsewhere but at the midpoint of the tribulation are stationed at Cyprus. Ezekiel gives us one more piece of the puzzle in 39:2 where God will turn Gog back and "leave but the sixth part" of his army. This can not be the end war, when his entire army will be destroyed and must, therefore, be the mid point invasion of Egypt, when Chittim afflicts him thus turning him back, or as Daniel states here, "he shall be grieved and return." Then, in his anger he attacks Israel instead.

Significantly, Cyprus is split down the middle between Greeks and Turks, who apparently mend their differences for the first half of the trib, but then it goes sour at the mid point. "Have intelligence" with those who forsake the covenant is supported by many of the passages applying to Israel in the End Times (see Am 2 and 3, Mt 24:10, Dt 32:31-35, Jer 50:6 etc). It is probably the same people he had previously divided the spoil with and possibly referred to by our Lord, symbolically, as the sycamore tree which is an inferior fig tree which would make it the end times den of vipers (compare Lk 17:6 and Acts 28:5).

It is at this point that "Sheba, Dedan and the Merchants of Tarshish" (Ez 38:13) protest his invasion of Israel. Tarshish is identified as England which is supported by the "Lions" thereof in the preceding verse which, Dan 7 describes as the Lion that stands on its own feet and can only be England *which pictures its Lion Rampant*. What is curious is the absence of America in this confrontation being Israel's closest ally. It is painfully obvious that we are no longer in a position to come to their assistance.

Daniel 11:31

"And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate."

"Arms shall stand " obviously indicates that he will take Jerusalem by force and specifically the Temple Mount which is precisely seen in Rev 11:2 where God 'gives' up the city to them for chastisement. This does not imply any type of 'wall of separation' as a result of a peace treaty between Israel and the Palestinians, as some suppose, but is assuredly the result of the previous war in the first year of the tribulation. It may be a reference to apostate Jews (as the next verse and 39 indicate), but more likely it is recruits from various nations and possibly those mentioned in Ps 83.

"The Sanctuary of Strength" is obviously the Temple complex and will be coming up again. "The Abomination of Desolation" can only be the event spoken of by our Lord in Mt 24, Paul in 2 Thes 2, Daniel in 8:11 and 9:27, and John in Rev 13. To separate these is to take unwarranted liberty with the Word, as they are all linked to the Daily Sacrifices and Mosaic Covenant as the general analogy (George Peters, The Theocratic Kingdom, Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1988) of the Scriptures clearly indicates. It is at this time that the Mark of the Beast system becomes mandatory upon point of death, which very probably will be implemented through computer chip implants but may be some other system (laser tattooed invisible bar codes, cattle tattoo ink, etc).

Digression

I want to digress here briefly. There is an opinion among Christians and American Patriots of my country that because he imposes this system over "all both small and great" that this demands that the US Government is going to help enforce this Satanic system in our country via Martial Law. However, the word 'all' is a generalization (Peters) which solely means that he forces this system on all those who have submitted to his ruink,

If there is a country or people in rebellion against him, then until he causes them to submit, he will not be successful in this enterprise. Thus, if Hitler had enforced this system, most of Europe would have been directly affected, but England and Russia would have been a different story. There is enough indication in the word that America, the Eagle of Dan 7, is going to be embroiled in a life and death battle against the revived Roman Empire (and the Beasts of the field) and may not, therefore, be forced into this situation (notice that the fourth beast of Dan 7 and the same beast of Rev 13 has no wings which it would if America was part of the empire).

Our lack of appearance in the last verse is another indication of this. The abomination which is set up is the image that the False Prophet (Rev 13) somehow brings to life. There are several scenarios that might occur to fulfill this possibility (clone, robot etc), but we should stick as close as possible to the Scriptures and the original words in order to understand what may come to pass.

Keep in mind that most people who see this event will probably do so via television (supported by those "in Judea" and "in the field" and "on the roof" in Mt 24, who see this event which they could not all see without a tele). The word image means exactly that, and you can't get more imaginary than a tv. And thus, this idolatrous affair may be a Live Broadcast of the Antichrist in the Holy of Holies claiming to be God and to which all under his dominion must bow down and worship, in their own living rooms, in front of their own personal idol.

The televisions now are designed to be interactive and are currently being utilized by certain Intelligence agencies to observe the personal habits of their citizens (I worked in telecommunications in the United States Air Force and this technology would be ludicrously easy to produce and applies to your satellite and Cable TV receivers and personal computers as well, all which can easily be used to individually target a specific person with custom propaganda that they would not even see, as well as mass brainwashing of whole communities or cultural and ethnic groups, and I can assure you, they are already doing so - they don't call it a monitor for nothing).

So, they would be able to monitor the population and enforce his worship in this way, at pain of death, which is very similar to what Daniel's three friends went through (Dan 3). Thus, "they shall place" might support this description. Y'shua in Mt 24 refers to the abomination "standing" (statis - denoting position not posture) and Paul "sitting" in 2 Thes 2, which could be a reference to either position or posture. But "place" here in Daniel (and in 12:1) is the word 'nathan' and means 'to give' and can also mean 'to send' indicating that they 'send out' a live televised broadcast of the abomination in which the Antichrist sitting in the temple, claims to be God demanding everyone's worship. This event may also include a sacrifice to himself, or more probably to his god the Dragon (Rev 13:4), which may very possibly be a human, cannibalistic sacrifice that causes the abomination.

Daniel 11:32-35

"And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall he corrupt by flatteries: but the people that do know their God shall be strong, and do exploits. And they that understand among the people shall instruct many: yet they shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, many days. Now when they shall fall, they shall be holpen with a little help: but many shall cleave to them with flatteries. And some of them of understanding shall fall, to try them, and to purge, and to make them white, even to the time of the end: because it is yet for a time appointed."

The persecution/chastisement of Judah then begins with some apostate Jews themselves helping this along. The righteous Jews will be persecuted and sent into captivity (the ones that didn't flee to the mountains as our Lord commanded) which other Prophets state as being sent to Babylon to help rebuild it (Zech 5, Ps 73, and note especially the thick clay of Hab 2:6 and is synonymous with the clay of Dan 2 and refers to peoples in general - slave or free). And still others remain in the city itself, apparently fighting against this army like they did in 70 AD etc.

This also is supported from other Scriptures where 1/3rd are killed, 1/3rd taken captive (Ez 39:23, Am 7:17, Ob 20, Mic 1:16, Rev 13:10, Luke 21:24 etc) and the remaining third holding on to the city for those three years until the return of their Messiah Y'shua. "Exploits" refers to the Jews that take up arms at this time, one of which may result in the head wound that the Antichrist receives around this time (Rev 13:3, Zech 11:17).

"Fall by the Sword" is talked about in most of the endtime passages, not only for Israel here, but most of the nations and peoples mentioned in the word (Ez 34 as mentioned previously, Rev 6 is clear on this point as well and the Olivet discourse, etc) and "by flame" is chillingly summed up by our Lord in Luke 23:28-31, "for if they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry?"

The "many days" again could be up to three years, as it actually is from this midpoint to the end of the tribulation when Israel's captivity is returned which is also spoken of in almost all end times passages concerning the entire nation. The "little help" may be a reference to the Two Witnesses (sun and moon) of Rev 12 that feeds the woman in the wilderness during this time. "Cleave to them" may be those our Lord referred to in Mt 24:23, but who are not really believers in the Messiah.

Daniel 11:36-39

"And the king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvelous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished: for that that is determined shall be done. Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women, nor regard any god: for he shall magnify himself above all. But in his estate shall he honour the God of forces: and a god whom his fathers knew not shall he honor with gold, and silver, and with precious stones, and pleasant things. Thus shall he do in the most strongholds with a strange god, whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory: and he shall cause them to rule over many, and shall divide the land for gain."

The last half of the tribulation, when the Revived Roman Empire as the seventh head (Rev 17:10-11) becomes the Revived Babylonian Empire, as the eighth head - The Assyrian becomes the Babylonian and Behemoth becomes Leviathan. He may also be "The Wicked" of the Psalms and "The Thief" of other passages (Zech 5 etc).

It is also possible (as previously stated) that the Antichrist himself receives a head wound (Rev 13:3) as his kingdom (notice in Dan 7:23-24 that both the Beast and his Kingdom are called "diverse" from the others - you can't separate the beast from his kingdom - hence he also will assuredly receive a head wound where his right eye is "darkened" and his right arm becomes basically useless in another prophecy) as his Kingdom did in the days of Napoleon, thus explaining, to some extent, the transition.

"Against the God of gods" indicates to me that at this time neither Evolution nor any Alien seeding theory (per the New Age - see Mission to Mars) is believed, but the Antichrist acts like one who knows God personally as they did in the days of Cain and Abel. He also rails against "those who dwell in heaven" which I believe is a direct reference to the Church (Rev 13:6) and also called the hidden ones in Ps 83:3 and other places *which indicates that it is the Pretribulational Rapture that finally kills the theory of Evolution.*

"The Desire of Women" (with the 'of' not part of the text - Strong's) should be the "Desirable Woman" or the Queen of Heaven that they worshiped which is in keeping with the context of the passage which is polytheism and assuredly not referring to the Antichrist being homosexual.

"The god of forces" here, one way or another, is the Dragon of Rev 13. The Dragon is the god of the primeval forces in the ancient world, that led to creation out of chaos, in their cosmology, and was universally worshipped in one form or other. A god "his fathers knew not" implies that not even Daniel in Babylon knew the name of this god and that it is probably antediluvian in origin.

Daniel 11:40

"And at the time of the end shall the king of the south push at him: and the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over."

Egypt and the start of the Armageddon Campaign, closely parallels Rev 9:13 and the sixth trumpet or about one month before the vial judgments start. "The Time of the End" is the very last part of the tribulation, and I am convinced that it starts with the sounding of the first trumpet. It is then that this prophecy will finally be understood (12:9) at the time of this third invasion.

Noticeably, in Jeremiah, Egypt moves his army (vs 6 and 10) "towards the north by the river Euphrates" which is an unmistakable reference to the source of that river in Turkey, showing, like Ez 38 that this is the country the Antichrist starts his rise from (*ie not Russia as Lindsey stated*), which is supported here in Daniel that states the king of the south starts this conflict, and that the Antichrist comes out to meet him "like a whirlwind" and they actually meet in Gilead (Jer 46:11 south of the Golan), with the Antichrist "entering into the countries" in the process (Syria, Lebanon and Jordan and possibly S. Arabia) and beats the Egyptian army back down through Jordan and Israel (vs 41) all the way to Egypt (vs 43) with the help of the Libyans etc (Ez 38:5 and Dan 11:43). He also, at this time, has a naval force "with many ships" and apparently took care of the previous problem with Cyprus.

Daniel 11:41-44

"He shall enter also into the glorious land, and many countries shall be overthrown: but these shall escape out of his hand, even Edom, and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon. He shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries: and the land of Egypt shall not escape. But

he shall have power over the treasures of gold and of silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt: and the Libyans and the Ethiopians shall be at his steps. But tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him: therefore he shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly to make away many."

Jordan (Moab, Edom and Ammon) "escapes out of his hand" indicates that he may have been in the process of spoiling their country, after returning from Egypt, but left off this attack. In Is 15 the refugees flee in a northern direction assuredly from the Antichrist (Ar and Kir are at the south end of the Dead Sea with Dibon and Nebo in the middle and Medebu and Heshban at the top) and then they flee to the mountains (Jer 48). Then some of them flee towards the west at the top of the Dead Sea (Is 15:5 Zoar).

It is at this point, when the Antichrist arrives around Rabbah (Amman), that these fugitives flee, but not from the Antichrist for this is when he receives "tidings out of the east and north" that causes him to cut short his destruction of Moab. This whole process is described by Jer 48:43 as Fear, Pit and the Snare. They flee from the fear of the Antichrist and then they flee from the tidings from the east and then many of them will be taken in the snare just after this in the Lord's Campaign, when the wicked nations shall be gathered together like thorns and briars to be burned (Rev 16:14, Jer 49:14 etc).

So, what are these tidings that have Moab and the Antichrist upset? It is, assuredly, the army from the East (Rev 16:12) called "The Lords of the Heathen" in Is 16:8, and the Lion of Moab's destruction in Is 15:9 (where Lion can also mean Tiger in the Hebrew - Strong's), and "the men of the east" in Ez 25:10 *which is conclusively proven by II Esdras and the army from the east which is the basis for John's prophecy of the same.*

That this army is not the Lord's Army, as some suppose, is clearly seen when we realize that the Lord and his army will be seen over Jerusalem (Zechariah 9:14) as an Eagle (Jer 48:40, 49:22) and this latter is assuredly where our Lord drew the symbol from (Mt 24:28), along with Job 39:20. The Lord's campaign at the end, after the nations are already gathered, is specifically when the Gentile nations experience their birthpains (Rev 1:7 - Ex 21:24) at the time of the Wrath of the Lamb and would not require the drying of the Euphrates river to prepare their way (Rev 16:12) and therefore this is the Asian Army.

The drying of the river is also mentioned at the judgment of Babylon (Jer 50:38, and 51:36) including the springs, just before it is destroyed; and thus, the drying of the springs of the river indicate that it is not the work of a Dam, as some Scholars teach, but is assuredly a result of the sun scorching the earth mentioned just previous to this (Rev 16:8 see also Ps 19:6, 121:6, Is 49:10, Mal 4:10, Is 30:26) and is probably when the "seven springs" of the Nile also go dry. *Thus my original conclusion however II Esdras makes it clear that the river runs dry for three hours due to a geological event such as an earthquake or minor pole shift and is, once again, the foundation for John's statements.*

This army is also called the Spoiler of Babylon (Jer 51:56, Is 33:1) and of Moab (Jer 48:8). However, they don't destroy the city, as that is reserved for the kings who built it (Rev 17:16), probably, in part, to destroy this very army, which apparently is not successful. Also it is around this very time that "the kingdoms of Ararat, Minni and Ashchenazi" attack the country of Babylon. The significance of this is that this is the home of the Armenians and the Kurds both of which have been severely persecuted by Turkey in history, and, apparently, are still holding a grudge against them (as well as the location to which the Ten Lost Tribes were exiled).

Thus, smelling blood, and with the Antichrist occupied in Egypt and Jordan, they attack his empire. Now, along with this, I have often wondered if, at this time, there would still be any motor vehicles in operation (lack of gas, oil etc), and it appears from Nahum 2 that there will be, and thus, it will not take long for this eastern army to get to the Jordan river from the Euphrates (about 500 miles thus about 1-2 days). When they draw near to the Jordan, the road that they must take; which runs "through the wilderness" as Isaiah 16:8 tells us about this very army; splits with one branch heading down to Amman where the Antichrist is and the other over to the Lebanon area and thus the tidings from both the North and the East (see also Jer 50:43, Is 21:7, Jer 51:31 and 46) are very possibly a result of the army splitting at this fork in the road as they both continue on towards the Jordan, and begin arriving in "the frontiers" (Ez 25:9) and "borders" (Is 15:8), of Moab or Jordan.

Amos specifies that fire will be the weapon of choice in their destruction and all the land east of Israel (Damascus, Edom, Tyrus, Ammon etc), and of course the weapon of choice of the army from the east is also fire (Rev 9:17-19) *which Ezra in his Apocalypse describes as a Star Weapon which is a crystal clear description of Hydrogen Nuclear Warfare and is the only prophecy of its kind in existence anywhere in any sacred visions anywhere in the world.*

This also inadvertently shows us that this army of 200 million; since it destroys several Arab countries on its way to Israel (and since several more are allied with the Antichrist - Libya and Ethiopia in vs 43 compared with Ez 38:5 which adds Persia or Iran to the list - and since he takes out Egypt and others in the area); is not an Arabic coalition of 200 million as some have recently suggested. And I remind everyone that one third of the world's population lives between Beijing and Beirut (Rev 9:18). Taken with their statement of being able to field that many men (which I read in 1978 in a popular weekly magazine), pretty much shows that it is an army of Asian countries that are marching to Israel at the very end of the trib in time for the Final Battle.

This is supported by the Three Frogs in Revelation that are sent out to gather the nations for that day - one to Asia, one to Africa and one to Europe. Most other countries, by that time, probably won't be able to put an army together (i.e. the countries in the New World, Australia and Philippines etc). So, at this, the Antichrist is "troubled" (here in Dan 11:44) and he heads north from Amman and gets to around modern day Massua when he finds out that the way north is also cut off by the other half of this eastern army.

He then does the prudent thing and crosses over the Jordan, probably on the Damia Bridge (which he assuredly destroys behind him) and which places him very near ancient (and modern)

Shiloh. It is now that Jer 49:19 tells us that he comes "up like a lion" from the swelling of the Jordan River (compare Jer 12:5, 50:44 and 59:19 specifically the tidal wave of the Asian army swelling the Jordan river in the process of crossing), which Daniel here describes "with great fury" matching Jeremiah's description, against the "sanctuary of strength" or the Temple.

Daniel 11:45

"And he shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him."

This is, of course, his third and final invasion of the Holy Land and he makes his last stand "Between the Seas," i.e. Mediterranean Sea and The Dead Sea. This is further detailed by Is 10 (which close examination proves is referring to the End Times and Armageddon), where the Antichrist's course is laid out (Aiath near Shiloh, Migran, Michmesh, Geba, Raman, Gebeah, Gallim, Laish, Anathoth, Medmevah, Gebim and finally Nob.

From Shiloh, he beats feat south towards Jerusalem, undoubtedly planning on making the city his final stand, but for some 'unknown' reason he circumvents Jerusalem and then stops at Nob, south west of the city and directly between the two seas.

I think if you consider that the above towns are assuredly all in the same general area (and that there were no vowels in the Hebrew hence some confusion as to the exact names) you will see that this Nob is actually Nebo, which is just NW of modern Beit Tzur. This is the same general area, within a couple of miles, of Josh 10, 1Sam 17, Joel 2:20, 2Chr 20 and this is the Valley of Beracah.

Interestingly enough, Beit Tzur means Rock and Strength and thus a Stronghold, which is an incredible fulfillment, to the minutest detail, for Is 31:9 tells us, that at this time, that the Assyrian, that is to say, the Antichrist will "flee from the sword" of the army from the east, "and he shall pass over" the Jordan river, "to his stronghold" at Beit Tzur.

This is also the "mountains of Israel" in Ez 38-39, and finally Joel 2:20 tells us that when he has dug in for this final conflict, he turns "toward the east [Dead] sea and his hinder part toward the utmost [Med] sea." Thus all these Scriptures, many of which are considered by some to be dealing solely with the past, unite in perfect harmony to give us a very detailed description of the Antichrist and his career up to the very end. The reason that he faces east in the end, is because, about now (Mt 24:27), the time has arrived for the Lord's Campaign at the Second Advent.

Conclusion

What I want to establish now is that this Vision is specifically to record the rise, fall and revival of the Ottoman Empire. This is seen in verse six expounding the career of Shagar which occurs

precisely with the rise of the Ottomans. It is also of some import that a branch of the Mameluks in Egypt were also Turks and that many of these came from Georgia specifically.

This explains one minor point in my understanding of the Biblical Narrative detailed above, and that is the 200 year span between verse 11:15 which refers to Salim in the 1500's and 11:16 which deals with Napoleon in the 1700's; for this was the apogee of the Ottoman Empire, during which they lost some territory and then gained it back and thus for those 200 years there were no major changes in the power structure of the Ottoman Empire or in Europe or the rest of the World.

And thus, the real decline in the Ottoman Empire began with Napoleon's invasion, exactly as the Biblical record tells us. This has been noted by several sources, but it is not commonly accepted, to my knowledge. But the interesting thing in this regard is that it was Nationalism which really gave the head wound to the Ottoman Empire via Napoleon and the French Revolution. And this itself can be traced right back to "The Glorious Revolution" in Britain, during which they basically put a straightjacket on the British Monarchy (The Mainstream of Civilization).

This Nationalistic Environment directly led to the American Revolution as well as that of France. It should be stated that the rise of modern day Nationalism coincides precisely with the rise of the Four Beasts of Daniel 7 and actually set the stage for the rise of the Antichrist as a map of the End Time Arena clearly shows. And this exact same condition is described in Daniel 2 as the Iron Mixed with Clay. The Iron represents the rulers of the Revived Roman Empire, and the Clay represents the people themselves (compare Is 64:8 and primarily Hag 2:5-6), especially as they are joined together in this spirit of nationalism.

The Antichrist will somehow, temporarily, overcome this nationalistic fervor, but in the end it will prove his undoing, just as it did the Ottoman Empire (*and as it has done for the recently defunct New World Order*). It is the Biblical description of this attempt to overcome Nationalism, that is recorded in the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse (synonymous with the Four Winds) and thus shows us that he will accomplish this by territorial expansion and dominating various nations during the first half of the tribulation ("You shall hear of wars and rumors of wars").

Some may doubt that the Ottoman Empire will be revived, but there are some indications that, in fact, it will be. The most important of which is that they are located geographically right in the heart of the Eurasian Arena placing them in a paramount location for ruling the world. The saying, "whoever controls the Mediterranean, controls the world" is still relevant today. This, more so when the Marmaray Bunnell (Bosphorus Tunnel) is completed leaving a large majority of the flow of the goods of Eurasia in the hands of Turkey (*ditto with the bridge over the Bosphorus they recently finished*).

Turkey has a very prominent position to play as the union of the East and West, North and South, Christianity and Islam. They, in a sense, are already geared for this leadership position, having been a member of NATO for many years and familiar with the Western World's ways and

technology, having been supplied, in no small part, by America after World War II *and, most significantly, they are the largest standing army in Europe.*

Post Scripts

The Glorious Land

Dan 11:16 "But he that comes against him shall do according to his own will, and none shall stand before him: and he shall stand in the Glorious Land, which by his hand shall be consumed."

In my post on Daniel's Last Vision I stated that the above verse was referring to Napoleon's invasion of Palestine, and that the Land was consumed due to his practice of "living off the Land." I had checked several books and numerous encyclopedias, but could find absolutely no information on his Palestinian Campaign, and thus concluded that this was how the land had been consumed. However, last night, I picked up a Book called, "Napoleon Bonaparte" (Alan Schom, Harper Perennial, 1998, pg 178), and found out some very interesting information. Napoleon arrived in Palestine in mid March, just as the barley would have been ripening. They destroyed four cities on the way up the coast and then besieged Acre where the Turks were holed up. They were unsuccessful there and around the start of May, when the wheat fields would have been "ripe unto harvest" they headed back down to Egypt. He then describes this retreat south in very powerful words.

"The road from Mr. Carmel to Jaffa over the next four days was depressing for the flagging stream of French troops. 'A devouring thirst rising from the complete lack of water and excessive heat, an exhausting march through burning sand dunes...our march was lit by the villages, hamlets, towns, and their fields of rich crops, all torched by our angry men...we were entirely surrounded by the dying, pillagers and arsonists...the brilliant sun in a beautiful sky was hidden by the pall of smoke from our constant conflagrations. We had the sea to our right, and to our left and behind us, the desert we ourselves were laying waste as we advanced.'"

I believe that these words from an eye witness are a perfect and exact fulfillment of the prediction made in the Word of God over 2500 years ago, and, as far as I am concerned, have proven that my interpretation is the correct one. It is, to me, the crowning point to this research. Another book ("Napoleon as Military Commander", James Marshall-Cornwall, Penguin Books, 1967) stated that because of the disastrous loss of the French Fleet off the coast of Egypt to the English, that France was pretty much in an uproar and being harassed by just about all the countries in Europe, and that "The Directory" that had "hastily" dispatched Napoleon to take Malta and Egypt (but not specifically Palestine - pg 81)) had then sent a letter to him telling him that he would need "to rely upon himself" (pg 170) and in their sarcasm at their extremity suggested he invade Constantinople (but no mention of Palestine or Syria). However, this letter did not reach the Corsican until after he had already started the siege of Acre and thus we see that Napoleon, in fact, did do "according to his own will" when he decided to invade Palestine, just as the Word of God tells us.

Not Be Found

Dan 11:19 "Then he shall turn his face toward the fort of his own land: but he shall stumble and fall, and not be found."

In my post on Daniel's last vision I stated that this prophecy was fulfilled when Napoleon was exiled on "an obscure island" and buried in an unmarked grave however, I didn't provide a reference, so I went back and looked it up again and here is what I found. Concerning his exile on St. Helena, Steven Englund ("Napoleon: A Political Life", Scribner, NY, 2004, pgs 448-9) says:

"So complete and far-flung an exile had little precedent among major heads of state, brought down in their prime...no one among the Emperor's ranking fideles and family elected or was permitted to accompany him to St. Helena."

The author goes on to state that the island was three thousand miles from any mainland and six hundred miles from the nearest island and that even Napoleon the third was allowed to pick where he was exiled. In Napoleon's case, he couldn't be turned over to the French for execution and they were worried that if they imprisoned him in England that he would actually win support from their own people and the French as the continuing Symbol of the Revolution (ibid). Thus, this led them to make this extreme decision of exile away from any touch with Civilization. This alone would qualify for the fulfillment of Scripture but it is even more so when we realize that he was indeed buried in an unmarked grave. Felix Markham ("Napoleon", Mentor Books, NY, 1966, pg 254) tells us that:

"Napoleon was buried in accordance with his wish in Geranium Valley, with full military honors organized by Lowe. Montholan proposed that the inscription on the tomb should read: Napoleon; Ne a Ajaccio Le 15 Aout 1769; Mort a Ste-Helene Le 5 Mai 1821. Lowe insisted that it should read: Napoleon Bonaparte. In the end, the tomb was left nameless."

Thus, once again, the Word of God is precisely fulfilled by world events 2500 years after the fact. And, I might add that, the original interpretation could only say that this prophecy was fulfilled in the life of Antiochus (or whoever), because he died at night. I will let the reader decide for himself.

A Prince for his own behalf

Dan 11:18 "But a Prince for his own behalf shall cause the reproach offered by him to cease; without his own reproach he shall cause it to turn upon him."

In my further studies on Daniel's Last Vision, I wanted to verify that Wellington, the Prince of the above verse, had indeed acted "On his own behalf" when he entered France to attack and defeat Napoleon. Just before he entered France he was made Commander in Chief of the Allied

Forces (according to one of the two sources in my last post on the Glorious Land), so that, he went from being the leader of a mere Expeditionary Force, to running the entire War against Napoleon - all without London's knowledge or even consent.

In her book, "Wellington: The Years of the Sword" Elizabeth Longford (Harper and Row Publishers, NY, 1969, pgs 278-790) stated that part of the reason for this lack of communication between Wellington and London was that, *"Affairs seem to be in a strange state in England; however, I trust that some government will be formed"* from the Duke himself on the various power plays that were taking place at the time between those who supported the war and those who wanted to make peace with Napoleon.

Thus it was that, under these very circumstances that, *"As usual Wellington kept his own counsel about his next moves. 'As you have left us,' he wrote on 28 May 1812 to George Murray, his valued quartermaster-general, 'I will not tantalize you by entering on our plans for the remainder of the campaign...' If Wellington's real object was to avoid leakages rather than tantalization, it was in line with a steady policy. Leakages to the enemy via London were still a major problem, and he had developed his natural discretion into a secretiveness which was commented upon by his half-admiring, half-irritated officers...'We hear little or nothing of Ld. Wellington, who keeps not only the Portuguese but the Officers of his Staff in the dark with regard to his Intentions.'"*

Thus we see that, with his own country in a state of political limbo, and the Spanish exalting him to the position of Commander of the Allied forces, and his own self imposed secrecy of his plans, this is a perfectly accurate and literal fulfillment of the Word of God that this Prince, indeed, did act "on his own behalf" when he defeated Napoleon on his own territory and caused "the reproach offered by him to cease." It is, perhaps, this very attitude that earned him the nickname (pg 280) of the Peer, by his officers (a title of Nobility) and The Eagle by the Spaniards.

The Robbers of your people

Dan 11:14 "And in those times there shall many stand up against the king of the south: also the robbers of thy people shall exalt themselves to establish the vision; but they shall fall."

In my post on Daniel's Last Vision, I stated that Shabbat Tzvi (also Shabbetai Zevi) fulfilled this prophecy perfectly and in the same contextual time that the Mamluks were being harassed however, I stated that the source might be Howard Sachar, but then I couldn't find this account in that book, so, once again, I researched it anew and here is what I found. Joan Comay ("Who's who in Jewish History", Oxford Univ. Press, Ny, 1974, pgs 330-1) says:

"In 1648 he declared publicly that he was the Messiah, uttering the forbidden name of God, which was taken as a Sign that the time of redemption had come...arriving in Jerusalem in 1663, he met Nathan of Gaza, who, two years later, hailed him as Messiah. Increasing persecution, and especially the Chmielnicki massacres in the Ukraine, made many Jews believe that the

darkest hour had been reached which would be followed by the redemption. Shabbetai returned in triumph to Smyrna in 1665, where his ecstatic welcome was noted by the English Ambassador. From there the movement inflamed Jewish communities throughout the World. The news that the Messiah had come was received with joy in Hamburg, Amsterdam and London. In Poland and Russia excited crowds marched through the streets carrying banners with a portrait of Shabbetai...a circular was sent to all Jewish communities in the name of 'The Only Begotten Son of God, Shabbatai Zevi, messenger and redeemer of the people of Israel.' In 1666, brought before the Sultan and given the choice of conversion or death, he denied his messianic claims and became a Muslim."

This is, of course, when his fall occurred and many of the people that he had defrauded of their money left his movement. The original interpretation totally ignores this Biblical description simply because they can't find its fulfillment in their system.

Appendix

David Hill (7 Aug 2002) "Daniel's Last Vision"

In reference to my interpretation of Daniel's Last Vision; in order to strengthen my own view of this great work; it is necessary to critique the original interpretation that has existed for some time in both Jewish and Christian circles. There is only one possible interpretation, and as the Word of God is a perfectly accurate Blueprint of things to come; and things that have already been; it should be an easy matter to show which interpretation is correct. Though I believe my interpretation stands on its own, prudence (as opposed to negligence) dictates that an objective examination be performed of the opposing view, i.e. the Onus Probandi (burden of proof), in this case lies with the Challenger. The critique can be divided up into 1) Major Discrepancies and 2) Minor Discrepancies.

I obtained the original interpretations from 1) Jamieson Fausset and Brown, Commentary on the Whole Bible, Zondervan Pub. House, MI, 1961 hereafter designated as J, and 2) John Walvoord and Roy Zuck, The Bible Knowledge Commentary, Victor Books, SP Publications, inc., 1985 hereafter designated as B.

Major Discrepancy

I) The End of Years

Dan 11:6 And in the end of years they shall join themselves together.

The first five verses of Daniel 11 are not open to debate for the sole reason that there is no doubt as to their meaning, ending with the division of Alexander's Kingdom to the four generals and the dominance of the king of the south.

The first problem arises in verse 6 with the statement, "The End of Years." B interprets this phrase as "after some years" for the simple reason that they don't have a convincing interpretation of the same. J interprets it as, "When the predicted time shall be consummated." This subterfuge is necessary because, with their interpretations, there is absolutely no reasonable application in the events described by them. The fact that you have two different definitions proves this.

Both of these sources arbitrarily ("not supported by fair, solid, and substantial cause and without reason given," Blacks Law Dict., Second Edition, West Pub. Co., Minn, 1910) lay aside the precise interpretation from the inspired text and substitute an imprecise paraphrase in its place. If this was a legal proceeding, their case would be thrown out of court, out of hand.

The "after certain years" makes no sense, as their account picks up immediately after the death of Ptolemy I - the first King of the south (285 BC). And further, this exact phrase including the word 'certain' (in the Hebrew), is used in verse 13, but it is not used in this verse. Thus, the KJ translation is assuredly correct.

The latter, "shall be consummated," doesn't occur, from their own description, until 147 BC, over 138 years later. On top of that, they both neglect to interpret the passage in its context. The angel (10:14) stated that the bulk of the vision was to show Daniel what would befall his people in "the latter days." This phrase is equivalent to the one in question. The Bible itself uses this term time and again as a reference to the latter days of this age - certainly not in reference to the year's before our Lord was born.

In this particular, my interpretation is Rock Solid compared to theirs (i.e. the end of the Middle Ages circa 1300 AD). The angel also states (12:4) that the defining characteristics of this period would be the increase in knowledge and travel which is a perfect and concise summary of the end of the middle ages and the rise of the modern era with its increased global explorations (especially that of the new world) and the increase in knowledge in all areas of society. Now, this is the foundational verse for their interpretation, and it is already placed in question. And the next point is similar to this one.

II) The Time of the End

Dan 11:35 And some of them of understanding shall fall, to try them, and to purge, and to make them white, even to the time of the end: because it is yet for a time appointed.

Just as the start of their case is in question, so also is the conclusion of their interpretation in doubt, by their own admissions. B states, *"In verses 36-45 a leader is described who is introduced simply as 'the King.' Some suggest that this is Antiochus Epiphanes and that the verse describes additional incursions of his into Israel. However, the details given in these verses were not fulfilled by Antiochus. True, Antiochus was a foreshadowing of a King who will come (cf. comments on 8:25). But the two are not the same...starting with Daniel 11:36 the prophecy moves from the 'near' to the 'far.'"*

And J states, *"Here [verse 31] Antiochus' actions are described in language which reach beyond him the type, to Antichrist the anti type...for the narrative seems to continue the history of Antiochus, though with features only in type applicable to him, fully to Antichrist."*

Now note first that there is disagreement between these sources about when the transition is made from Antiochus to the Antichrist (i.e. vs 31 as opposed to vs 36) showing that the application to the former is not as clear cut as has been assumed.

J's interpretation leaves absolutely no natural division derived from the passage itself by a clear statement to this change, and is an argument from silence solely because they don't even mention the transition or where, precisely, it occurs.

B's attempt "from near to far" is almost as impotent, not only because the Scriptures are silent in this verse to a transition, but mainly because this clear cut transition was already given in verse six, when it emphatically stated that the vision then makes a major transition from the times of the Grecian Empire to the end of this age (compare 10:14b).

The authors felt the force of this vacuum and tried to bolster their defense with the supposed introduction of the Antichrist "simply" as the King. But this "simply" means that verse 36 is still referring to the king of the preceding passage, as an unbiased reading shows (which J obviously realized). And finally, both sources, burdened with the "proof" that doesn't exist, retreat to the ever popular spiritualization principle of, "when in doubt metaphor it out".

Because the passage was not fulfilled in crystal clear details, they say he was just a type of the coming dictator. In fact, J is so unclear on this point, that he even includes, not only Antiochus and the Antichrist, but Muhammad himself throughout the remainder of the passage as a possible fulfillment of these things, if only in type. Now, this would be considered the "closing argument" for their case, and just as in their opening argument, not only can they not agree amongst themselves, neither one of their interpretations can be made to fit the Biblical facts.

III) Former or Latter

Dan 11:29 At the time appointed he shall return, and come toward the south; but it shall not be as the former, or as the latter.

Concerning verse 29 J has an interesting statement, *"or, making this the third expedition [into Egypt], the sense is, 'not as the first or as the second' expeditions."*

The problem is simply this; Contrary to popular ignorance on this matter, Antiochus made four expeditions into Egypt, the first of which was when he captured Ptolemy Philometer. And yet, the individual of the Biblical record only invades Egypt, as here stated, three times.

So, J tries to circumvent this problem two ways. Concerning verse 25 he tries to say that this is, "a fuller detail of what was summarily stated (vss 22-24)." Thus turning four invasions into three. But, this goes against the flow of the passage concerning the career of this individual, which is subsequently proven by B who stated, "these verses describe Antiochus IV Epiphanes...[who] is given as much attention as all the others before him combined." Yet, with all this attention to detail that this passage affords, B neglects to even mention the first invasion of Egypt and the capture of Ptolemy, in order to maintain the inherent flow of the passage, which only shows three invasions.

Again, this is an argument from silence, and even more, it is a Hermeneutical Malpractice of sorts. And J's second attempt of dodging the issue is to, once again, paraphrase the Inspired Word to make the theory fit the facts that don't match the Biblical description - plain and simple. But, more than that, this is the main personage of the passage involved, and they don't agree on how to correctly interpret the passage. With the start and end being the foundation, this would be the capstone, and yet this whole edifice is built upon arguments from silence, and personal paraphrases of the Word.

IV) The Prince of the Covenant

Dan 11:22 And with the arms of a flood shall they be overflowed from before him, and shall be broken; yea, also the prince of the covenant.

In verse 22 a "Prince of the Covenant" is broken and yet again, the interpreters are at odds as to who this individual might be, where as, if *"the context so accurately agrees with the relations of Antiochus to Ptolemy that the primary reference seems to be to the 'league' between them"* (J), then there should be no doubt as to this person's identity, yet B, because they don't acknowledge the first 'invasion' of Egypt by Antiochus, which ended with this covenant, they find the fulfillment in *"Onias III, the high priest, called here a prince of the covenant"* whom Antiochus disposed.

This interpretation would also make "the league with him" separate from "the covenant" which may be the case, but is in conflict with the previous interpretation and what, to me, is the logical understanding of the passage - one covenant, and that the Holy Covenant (Mosaic) as stated in other passages in Daniel and further in this passage, when the same covenant is subsequently broken.

The significance of this is that the confirming of the covenant (Dan 9) is the official start of the tribulation (and the major point of this vision) and their views break up the general analogy of the word, and the flow of the passage, and provide no initiatory confirmation of the covenant that is the focus of the latter part of the passage. And, for this reason (and others) they must interpret the abomination of desolation in this passage as referring to Antiochus, as opposed to our Lord who applied it to the Antichrist. If both interpretations were in agreement, it would make the case more solid, but the fact that they can't agree on the prime criteria for the rise of the "vile one" should lead the reader to discard their interpretation as unfounded.

V) Forecast Devices

Dan 11:24 He shall enter peaceably even upon the fattest places of the province; and he shall do [that] which his fathers have not done, nor his fathers' fathers; he shall scatter among them the prey, and spoil, and riches: [yea], and he shall forecast his devices against the strongholds, even for a time.

The success of this "vile one", the Scriptures (vs's 24-25) attribute to "devices" that he "forecasts" against the king of the south. Remember that this is the individual that the entire passage (or according to B the majority of the passage) is referring to. Thus, you would think that this statement should be easily ascertainable from history. Yet B fails, once again, to even mention the phrase. J makes an attempt by, once again, paraphrasing the Inspired text as, "he shall form a studied scheme" against the king of the south.

Devices (machashebeth) means a contrivance, or texture, machine or abstractly - intentions (Strong's Exhaustive Con.). Thus, the passage itself should determine for us if this is an abstract idea, as they propose, or a device as the primary definition requires.

Now, verse 21 talks about the arms as a flood which a casual understanding would equate to a military confrontation (which J does not but B does agree with), and vs 24 specifies that this individual takes a spoil - an obvious reference to the spoils of war (which B acknowledges and J totally ignores), and vs 26 tells us that the king of the south shall be destroyed (shabar - to burst, breakdown, in pieces, crush, destroy etc) which, by their interpretation, he was not (he was left in power), which both interpreters pass over, once again, in silence, even though in vs 11:20, where this word is also used, both acknowledge that Seleucus Philopator was assassinated by poison and thus destroyed.

So, here we see that the entire tenor of the passage is; after the initial rise to power by "intrigue" or "flatteries"; one of military conflict. Thus the device, assuredly, is not referring to an abstract "studied scheme" but a military device of some kind. I stated in my interpretation that this is a very accurate description of a pre-emptive tactical nuclear strike, which would fit the martial context of the passage.

And now we can look at the 'minor' discrepancies of their positions.

Minor Discrepancy

1) Both authors ignore, in verse 14, "the robbers of your people" which I showed was fulfilled, to a tee, by Shabbati Tzvi.

2) Both ignore "not be found" in verse 19, which I showed was referring to Napoleon being exiled on an obscure island and buried in an unmarked grave.

3) J says that "he who comes against him" in vs 16 is still referring to Antiochus Epiphanes, when the passage indicates that it is someone else. And this is where the mistake is made concerning the origins of the Antichrist - North or West (see post on the King of the West). B totally ignores the description. The passage itself, by grammatical rules, implies another individual other than Antiochus which B obviously realized and which J passes over without explaining why it is Antiochus against the proper rules of grammar.

4) "His own behalf" in verse 18 is ignored by B and claimed by J even though B states that Scipio was not acting on his own behalf but had been dispatched from Rome specifically to turn Antiochus back.

5) "Within few days" of vs 20 is ignored by B because Seleucus Philopater reigned for 12 years, not a few days. J says that these 12 years were a few days compared to the 37 years that Antiochus ruled. I personally find this hard to believe and this is the exact reason why I discarded my original interpretation of this being Charles X, for the simple reason that he reigned for 7 years or so. The omission of B is very telling in this regard, indicating that they also believe that 12 is a tad bit too long to stretch those 'few days.'

7) In verse 7 the king of the south invades and conquers the "fortress of the king of the north" which at the time was Antioch, yet this was not accomplished by the person in question, but instead it was a city in Assyria, whereas in my interpretation Baybar in fact did attack and overcome the city. This is a glaring minor discrepancy and makes the Scriptures seem like inaccurate guesses instead of a precise history written in advance. The same, exactly, is true of verses 10 and 13.

So, those are just some of the problems with the original interpretation of Daniel's Last Vision, and I only looked at this today. I haven't had time to search it out completely, nor do I feel the need to continue, for I feel that I have proven my point, and now the Burden of Proof lies in the other camp.

Bibliography

- 1) King James Version of the Bible, Placed by the Gideon's, 1982
- 2) The Mainstream of Civilization, Harcourt, Brace and World Inc. 1969
- 3) The Ancient Mediterranean, Michael Grant, Meridian Pub. Ny, 1969
- 4) Alexander of Macedon, Peter Green, University of California Press, 1982
- 5) Dictionary of Wars, George C. Kohn, Facts on File publications, 1986
- 6) The Napoleonic Revolution, Robert Holtman, Louisiana State University Press, 1978
- 7) Napoleon Bonaparte, Alan Schom, Harper Perennial, 1998
- 8) Napoleon: A Political Life, Scribner, NY, 2004
- 9) Napoleon as Military Commander, James Marshall-Cornwall, Penguin Books, 1967
- 10) Napoleon, Felix Markham, Mentor Books, NY, 1966
- 11) Wellington: The Years of the Sword, Elizabeth Longford, Harper & Row Publishers, NY, 1969
- 12) The Waterloo Campaign, Albert Nofi, Combined Books, 1993

- 13) A History of the Balkans, Ferdinand Schevill, Dorset Press, Ny, 1991
- 14) A History of Israel, Howard Sachar, Alfred A. Knoph, Inc, Ny, 1996
- 15) Who's who in Jewish History, Oxford Univ. Press, Ny, 1974
- 16) The Arabs, revised ed., Philip K. Hitti, Henry Pegnery Company, Chicago, 1943
- 17) Theocratic Kingdom, George N.H. Peters, Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1988
- 18) The American People's Encyclopedia, Spencer Press Inc., Chicago, 1955
- 19) Dictionary of the Bible, Charles Scribners and Sons publishers, New York, NY, 1900
- 20) Funk & Wagnall's Standard Ref. Ency., Standard Reference Works Pub. Com., Inc., Ny, 1967
- 21) Strong's Exhaustive Concordance, James Strong, Abingdon Press, NY, 26th Printing, May 1965.

<http://theferrum.activeboard.com>